

**CONFIDENTIAL**

SSA-DD/M&S 73-0963  
DD/M&S 73-4484

14 November 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Officer, DD/M&S

SUBJECT : MSAG Proposal Concerning M&S Positions in Other Directorates

Tex:

1. Per your request, I have stated below my views on the MSAG proposal that the DD/M&S take over control of both slots and people for M&S positions in other Directorates. While I am in complete agreement with the desire to improve career planning wherever we can, and I certainly favor good management, I think that this proposal is not a very good one, and it is highly unlikely that it would ever be approved. I do not think it would result in any real advantages, and could result in substantial disadvantages. In addition, to aggressively pursue it could result in dissension which would set us back in the effort to bring the Agency components closer together. The DCI and the DDO are looking for overseas positions, including COS slots, which could be filled by non-DDO personnel. I don't think the DDO would easily accept a precedent whereby he would lose control of slots occupied by non-DDO staffers since he would lose control of certain overseas activities.

2. I do not agree with certain of the statements contained in the MSAG paper, nor with certain implications which are inherent in those statements. With respect to the first paragraph, I do not agree that the present practice is necessarily inequitable, that it significantly limits the DD/M&S Offices in accomplishing long-range planning of personnel resources, or that it hampers career planning and developmental efforts. I wonder which of the members of MSAG has had the experience which would qualify him to draw such a sweeping conclusion. As of 23 October 1973, there were [redacted] overseas and headquarters positions in the DDO

25X9

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

which were occupied by DD/M&S careerists. This represents less than 10 percent of the personnel strength of the DD/M&S and could not possibly be a controlling factor in the over-all management of DD/M&S personnel. This figure includes [REDACTED] MF positions, both field and headquarters, which does represent a significant part of the total MF Career Service. However, the Director of Finance has well established policies and procedures for incorporating the management of these positions into his over-all career management programs. The only component in which the Office of Logistics has a significant investment of personnel is EA Division, and even there they have only [REDACTED] ML positions. With respect to the [REDACTED] MG positions in the DDO, on the basis of my personal experience I am convinced that whatever problems we have in career development and personnel planning are not attributable to the fact that the slots are on the T/O of the DDO. Security has only a handful of people in the DDO, and they couldn't possibly pose a major problem for OS. I have served in many components of the Agency, and I have never yet encountered any difficulty in the management of the M&S positions in those components, or in the training or the career development of the incumbents. (On a few occasions, however, I have had to fill M&S slots with DDO or DDI personnel because there were no M&S nominees.)

3. Paragraph 2 of the MSAG memorandum states that the 1964 policy issued by General Carter "left unresolved the matter of 'who' would control the positions." This is not true. The memorandum may not have stated the policy in terms clear enough for critics, but the question of who would control the positions was never an issue, either before or after General Carter's memorandum. His memorandum clearly stated the single policy change which was to take place, and it was equally clear that there would be no change in the fundamental premise that the slots themselves would be controlled by the command component to which they were assigned. If the change proposed by MSAG is ever put into effect it would be a change of policy, but no one could ever seriously contend that it was a resolution of an issue which has remained unresolved for the past nine years.

4. During the past two or three years we have heard a few M&S officers complain that they are unable to influence management in the components to which they are assigned. While I have never had that experience, I acknowledge that such situations may have existed. Generally, however, an M&S officer can win acceptance in his component if he has a contribution to make, and if he tries to be a member of the team. If we change the organizational structure so that

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

the M&S officer is not a part of the command team, I think we may then find that he is in fact on the outside looking in. Under such circumstances even the best of our M&S officers would have difficulty in integrating themselves into the operational programs, and the relationships in the components would be roughly similar to those that now exist, for example, between an Area Division and the Central Travel Branch. We cannot point to Commo or OTS as proof that such an arrangement will work, because their roles are purely supportive and there is no overlap of interests in their technical responsibilities. Further, I am not sure that their programs are models of efficiency anyway. In the M&S area there is a substantial overlap of interests and it is necessary that there be close cooperation if they are to function efficiently. I am also convinced that, if the DD/M&S units become semi-independent, there would be a new layer of supervision established in the operating components which would, in effect, downgrade the authority of the MG officer and the M&S units. I can give you examples if you need them, and not all are in the DDO. The senior M&S officer would suddenly find himself reporting to a "Chief of Operations," a "Plans Officer" instead of the Office Head.

5. I think that, if the control of the M&S slots should be transferred to the individual DD/M&S components, there might be a tendency to have more people overseas than we actually need. This is not a criticism of the DD/M&S offices, but simply a statement which I think is supported by the facts. In the first place, the operating component would ask for more people than they need because they would not be charged to the operating component. In addition, the proponents of the MSAG recommendation are clearly oriented toward placing or retaining more--never less--of their own careerists at the overseas posts. This was clearly the view of the MSAG officer who discussed the situation with me during the study. When OTS was transferred from the DDO to the DDS&T, previously scheduled personnel reductions were canceled. When any component has very few positions at overseas posts, and when there are not enough slots to provide opportunity and experience for the best of the career service, it would not be reasonable to expect that component to aggressively pursue a reduction program. Under the present system, reduction pressures are about equal on both sides. I do not see how the M&S strength levels of the overseas units can be accurately evaluated except through an appraisal of the program to which they are assigned. Overseas support requirements are generally being decreased except in Communications, and I am

NOT TRUE

**CONFIDENTIAL**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2000/06/06 : CIA-RDP81-00261R000700030086-2

not aware of any proposal by an M&S Office that its overseas strength be reduced below the level recommended by the Station. On the other hand, I have been impressed with the fairness with which the past reductions have been allocated. M&S overseas components have taken no more than their proportionate share of the cuts; and in Saigon, which was hit most heavily, the M&S components were cut less than the DDO components. The "double jeopardy" theory is a myth I will be glad to debate with anyone.

25X1C 6. The transfer of responsibility from the Area Division to the various DD/M&S Offices would result in a substantial increase in the administrative workload in those Offices without a corresponding reduction in the workload in the Area Divisions. It would be necessary to establish separate facilities to process personnel overseas and back to Headquarters, and handle their support while they are overseas. The Office of Communications now controls its own positions, but it also has to do its own overseas processing, [REDACTED], and provide an administrative structure at headquarters to support the overseas operation. It has a staff of 12 people handling this. The same situation exists in the Office of Technical Service, which was recently transferred from the DDO to the DDS&T, and in the other DDS&T offices. Even if the M&S processing functions were centralized in some DD/M&S component such as the Career Management Officer, it would still require new positions and result in a duplication of effort. The proponents of the MSAG position probably assume that the DDO would continue to provide the present services, but that has never happened in the past and I doubt that it will in the future. *not true*

7. There are other serious administrative considerations which may not have been considered by the MSAG. If the M&S overseas components are removed from the DDO, it will mean that the DD/M&S will have to assume responsibility for the budgeting, not only for the salaries of the personnel, but also for travel, housing, schooling, etc., and establish machinery to administer the programs. It would also further fragment the liaison with State in personnel and OPRED problems. Again, MSAG may have assumed that the DDO would continue to provide these services, but I doubt that it would happen. In addition, the DD/M&S would have to add up to 50 slots to the M&S development complement to take care of rotational overlaps now absorbed by the DDO. Salaries for both the employee returning from overseas and his replacement, including the period during which the returnee is on home leave, are now charged to the budget of the

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

Area Division, which means that funds actually obligated for salaries are far in excess of the amount budgeted on the basis of a fixed number of ceiling positions. These are, of course, administrative tasks which can be handled, but they would take additional personnel and would be much less efficient than the present centralized administration.

8. There are a number of people in the DDO who would look with favor on the MSAG recommendation. Several months ago the DDO Plans Staff considered making a similar proposal to the DDO because they felt that it was one way to transfer certain costs and personnel problems from the DDO to the DD/M&S. These related mostly to the rotational overlap described in the earlier paragraph. In any case, I stated at that time that I thought the advantages to be gained were purely illusory, and that it would be a step backward with respect to the efforts to bring the various components into a "single Agency."

9. I do not contend that we should continue to follow old practices just because that is what we have always done. In this case the present system may not be perfect but it is better than the alternative being offered. In fact, I think I could make a case for improved economy and efficiency through more centralization overseas -- not less. If an operating official has the responsibility for certain programs, he must also have control of the assets which are applied to the accomplishment of his objectives. I think this principle is followed in all military and civilian organizations. Within the past few weeks I have heard Mr. Colby state that the Chief of a given station is the manager of all Agency assets in that country, and the senior spokesman for the U. S. intelligence community. The recent reorganization of the DDO would have been impossible if, during that reorganization, the DDO could not reallocate the M&S positions from the components being abolished to those being created. All of the older M&S officers worked very hard to staff and support the recommendations which led to General Carter's policy statement in 1964, and applauded his decision when it was published. There is a big difference, however, in establishing and perfecting a Career Service to work within an organizational structure, and establishing one which is to manage from without. I don't think the latter could ever be effective, particularly overseas.



Special Support Assistant to the DD/M&S

25X1A

CONFIDENTIAL